2 3

4 5

7

8

6

9

1112

13

14

15

17

16

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

ORIGINAL

COMMISSIONERS

GARY PIERCE, Chairman BOB STUMP SANDRA D. KENNEDY PAUL NEWMAN BRENDA BURNS

RECEIVED

2011 MAR 29 P 3: 41

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL



Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

EV

MAR 2 9 2011

DOCKETED BY

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF RIGBY WATER COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF ASSETS AND CONDITIONAL CANCELLATION OF ITS CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

DOCKET NO. W-01808A-10-0390

RIGBY WATER COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO STAFF REPORT

Applicant Rigby Water Company hereby responds to the Staff Report for Rigby Water Company – Application for Approval of Transfer of Its Assets to the City of Avondale and Conditional Cancellation of its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for Water Service dated March 15, 2011(the "Staff Report"). Although Rigby Water Company is generally in agreement with the findings and recommendations supporting transfer of its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CC&N") and assets to the City of Avondale (the "City"), which is awaiting entry of a final judgment completing a condemnation of that Certificate in a Maricopa County Superior Court action, there are procedural recommendations in the Staff Report that are incongruent with the completion of the condemnation action and the orderly and prompt transfer of Rigby's assets to the City.

The principal practical problem with Staff's Report stems from its recommendation that "Rigby's CC&N stay in effect, for the sole purpose of the MXA [mainline extension agreement] refund, until all the MXA is paid or when the time elapses whichever comes first." [Staff Report at 4.] Staff's recommended condition in this regard is unworkable and legally untenable. Rigby Water Company cannot both be subject to the continuing

BRYAN CAVE LLP
TWO NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE, SUITE 2200
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004-4406
(602) 364-7000

obligations of a holder of a CC&N in the area condemned by the City, and have its assets and service area be completely taken over by the City, as provided in the condemnation proceeding. Rigby Water Company's CC&N is a principal asset being acquired by the City; it cannot be taken by the City and also kept in effect for the remaining term (nearly ten years) of Rigby Water Company's single outstanding mainline extension agreement.¹

Under well-established Arizona law, a CC&N obligates a private water utility to provide water service to any customers seeking utility service within the boundaries of the CC&N. See James P. Paul Water Co. v. Arizona Corporation Comm., 137 Ariz. 426, 429, 671 P.2d 404, 407 (1983). Once granted, the Arizona Supreme court has specifically noted that "the certificate confers upon its holder an exclusive right to provide the relevant service for as long as the grantee can provide adequate service at a reasonable rate." Id. at 429, 671 P.2d at 407; see also In re Application of Trico Elec. Coop., 92 Ariz. 373, 380-81, 377 P.2d 309, 315-16 (1962). Under Arizona law and Staff's recommendation, Rigby Water Company would arguably continue to be required to provide water service to anyone seeking service within the boundaries of its existing CC&N, even though the infrastructure for providing such service would have been condemned by the City.

Moreover, the settlement agreement entered into by the parties to the condemnation suit and approved by the City's Council requires that Rigby Water Company obtain the cancellation of its CC&N from the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") prior to entry of final judgment in the City's pending condemnation suit. Staff's recommended condition would delay entry of final judgment for the remaining term of the mainline extension agreement, and in essence stall final entry of judgment in the City's suit, thwarting the City's desire to immediately take over the provision of water service within Rigby's CC&N area. It

687395.02

The Staff Report contains a related recommendation (in paragraph 3, p. 4) that approval of Rigby Water Company's pending Application be conditioned on Rigby Water Company filing a motion to delete its conditional CC&N once the obligations of the mainline extension agreement have been met or the term of that agreement expires, which again is scheduled for approximately ten years. That recommended condition should be rejected, along with the indeterminate continuance of Rigby Water Company's CC&N.

is doubtful that Staff intended by this recommended condition that the City's takeover of service be delayed for approximately ten years.

The City Council approved the settlement of the condemnation action and the general details of taking over Rigby Water Company's CC&N and assets last September. A final Settlement Agreement setting forth those full details has since been finalized. Rigby Water Company's CC&N is essentially being deleted in favor of municipal service within its borders. As in other cases where the entire assets and certificate of a public service corporation are condemned by a municipality under Title Nine of the Arizona Revised Statutes, for the City's takeover to be completed, a "clean" transfer and deletion of the CC&N without conditions must occur.

There are other means to enforce Rigby Water Company's ongoing contractual obligation to provide refund payments pursuant to the existing mainline extension agreement. Rigby Water Company's current agreement with the City makes specific provisions for such repayments, including provisions requiring the City to provide Rigby Water Company with the sale and revenue information necessary to calculate annual refunds under the mainline extension agreement. Requiring Rigby Water Company's CC&N to remain in effect during this period provides no additional security; the contractual basis of Rigby's obligation to provide refunds under the existing mainline extension agreement remains in place with or without a CC&N. Moreover, Rigby Water Company has told Staff that it is willing to post cash security in a segregated account, or separate escrow account under the control of the Commission on agreed terms, if there is a concern about ongoing security. But to ransom the very asset being transferred as security for a comparatively small refund payment stream is inappropriate and unfair to the City as well as Rigby Water Company, both of which have been awaiting conclusion of the substantial condemnation case for over six months.

Because Staff's recommendation with respect to the continuation of Rigby Water Company's CC&N are unnecessary and impracticable, Rigby Water Company objects to inclusion of the second and third conditions found on page 4 of the Staff Report in any order entered by the Commission with respect to Rigby Water Company's present Application

687395.02

BRYAN CAVE LLP TWO NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE, SUITE 2200 PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004-4406 (602) 364-7000

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 29th day of March, 2011.

BRYAN CAVE LLP

Bv

Stanley B. Lutz, #021195

Two N. Central Avenue, Suite 2200

Phoenix, AZ 85004-4406

Attorneys for Rigby Water Company